

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHER DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

NEXT Payment Solutions, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.,

Defendant.

Case No. 17 CV 8829

DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER

Defendant CLEAResult Consulting Inc., by and through its counsel, submits this motion to modify certain pretrial deadlines in the Court’s June 11, 2021 Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 459). After learning that NEXT intended to present an entirely new theory of unjust enrichment at trial—that at best was dismissed as part of this Court’s ruling on summary judgment or at worst another attempt to amend the complaint—CLEAResult filed an early motion in limine to exclude NEXT’s new theory on September 8, 2021 (Dkt. No. 460).

Accordingly, CLEAResult now moves the Court to (a) set September 22, 2021 as the deadline for NEXT to respond to CLEAResult’s September 8 Motion in Limine; (b) extend the deadlines from November 8, 2021 to December 3, 2021 for the parties to file their pretrial order and remaining motions in limine; and (c) extend the deadline from November 22, 2021 to December 17, 2021 for the parties to file responses to the remaining motions in limine.¹

¹ On September 3, 2021, the parties met and conferred regarding the issues addressed in this motion. CLEAResult engaged in a good-faith attempt to resolve the disputes at issue, but the parties were unable to reach an agreement. It is CLEAResult’s understanding that NEXT plans to respond to CLEAResult’s September 8 Motion in Limine on November 22, 2021 (the date in the

As explained in detail in CLEAResult's September 8 Motion in Limine and accompanying memorandum of law, the narrow set of issues to be tried on January 31, 2022 are whether CLEAResult owes NEXT for certain licenses and other "services" valued at approximately \$500,000.

NEXT, however, announced in the parties' June 5, 2021 Joint Statement (Dkt. No. 458) that it intends to present a new theory at trial: that CLEAResult is liable for common law unjust enrichment for the "misuse" of NEXT's "proprietary" information, which includes unidentified "confidential information" and NEXT's internet "domains." According to NEXT, it is entitled to \$423 million in damages for this sprawling and amorphous "misappropriated proprietary information" theory.

In the interest of judicial efficiency, CLEAResult respectfully requests that the Court take up its September 8 Motion in Limine now—before the Pretrial Order ("PTO") is due—so that the parties (and Court) may appropriately prepare for the January 2022 trial knowing whether NEXT's "misappropriated proprietary information" theory is or is not part of the case. If it is part of the case, the issues that the parties and Court need to address before trial (including in the PTO) are substantial.² If it is not, the pre-trial issues will be modest.

Thus, in the interests of judicial efficiency, efficiency and cost for the parties, and avoidance of prejudice, CLEAResult thus respectfully asks that the Court to enter an order:

Court's Order of June 11, 2021 for responses to motions in limine), and that it will not agree to jointly move the Court for an adjustment of pretrial deadlines to give the Court an opportunity to consider CLEAResult's September 8 Motion in Limine before the PTO is prepared and submitted to the Court.

² Among other things, CLEAResult anticipates extensive motions in limine and numerous disputes about the relevancy of exhibits and testimony that relate solely to NEXT's "misappropriated proprietary information" theory if CLEAResult's September 8 Motion in Limine is not granted.

- a) requiring NEXT to respond to CLEAResult's September 8 Motion in Limine by September 22, 2021;
- b) extending the deadline for the Pretrial Order from November 8, 2021 to December 3, 2021 (to allow sufficient time for the Court to consider the September 8 Motion in Limine before the parties need to prepare and finalize the PTO);
- c) extending the date for motions in limine from November 8, 2021 to December 3, 2021; and
- d) extending the deadline for responses to motions in limine (other than CLEAResult's September 8 Motion in Limine) from November 22, 2021 to December 17, 2021.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2021.

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

By: s/J. Matthew Donohue
J. Matthew Donohue (*admitted PHV*)
Matt.Donohue@hklaw.com
Shannon Armstrong (*admitted PHV*)
Shannon.Armstrong@hklaw.com
601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 1800
Portland, OR 97204
Tel: (503) 243-2300
Fax: (503) 241-8014

Anthony J. Fuga (#6301658)
Anthony Fuga@hklaw.com
150 N. Riverside Plaza, Ste. 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 715-5771
Fax: (312) 578-6666

Attorneys for Defendant
CLEAResult Consulting Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused the foregoing MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER to be served on the following person[s]:

Devan V. Padmanabhan Michelle E. Dawson Britta S. Loftus Paul J. Robbennolt Erin O. Dungan Sri K. Sankaran Padmanabhan & Dawson, P.L.L.C. 45 South 7th Street, Suite 2315 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Telephone: (612) 444-3377 Facsimile: (612) 444-3195 devan@paddalawgroup.com michelle@paddalawgroup.com britta@paddalawgroup.com paul@paddalawgroup.com erin@paddalawgroup.com sri@paddalawgroup.com	Paul B. Thanasides Mary Ruth Thanasides McIntyre Thanasides Bringgold Elliott Grimaldi Guito & Matthews, P.A. 500 E. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 200 Tampa, FL 33602 Telephone: (813) 223-0000 paul@mcintyrefirm.com mary@mcintyrefirm.com Bartholomew B. Torvik Torvik Law LLC 701 Main St. #204 Evanston, IL 60202 bart.torvik@torviklaw.com
--	--

by CM/ECF electronically mailed notice from the Court on the date set forth below.

DATED September 8th, 2021.

s/J. Matthew Donohue
J. Matthew Donohue